

Seboomook Unit Management Plan

IX. Appendices

Appendix A: Advisory Committee Members

Appendix B: Summary of Management Issues

Appendix C: Summary of Written Public Comments

Appendix D: Deed Restrictions and Agreements

Appendix E: Guiding Statutes

Appendix F: Glossary

Appendix G: References

Appendix A

Seboomook Unit Management Plan Advisory Committee

Seboomook Unit Planning and Management Staff

David Soucy - *Director, Bureau of Parks and Lands*
Ralph Knoll – *Deputy Director (retired), Bureau of Parks and Lands*
Kathy Eickenberg - *Management Plan Coordinator*
Cindy Bastey – *Chief Planner, Bureau of Parks and Lands*
Peter Smith – *Regional Manager, Public Reserved Lands Western Region*
Leigh Hoar – *Forester, Western Reserved Lands Region*
Tim Hall – *Regional Manager, State Parks Northern Region*
Matt LaRoche – *Manager, Penobscot River Corridor*
Tom Charles – *Chief of Silviculture, Bureau of Parks and Lands*
Joe Wiley – *IF&W Wildlife Biologist assigned to the Bureau of Parks and Lands*
Brooke Wilkerson – *Maine Natural Areas Program specialist assigned to the Seboomook Unit*
Scott Ramsay – *Supervisor, Off-Road Vehicle Program of the Bureau of Parks and Lands*
Tom Desjardin – *Historic Sites Specialist*
George Powell – *Boating Facilities Director, Bureau of Parks and Lands*
Stephen Richardson – *Senior Forest Engineer, Bureau of Parks and Lands*

Other State Agency and Public Members

John Banks, *Bangor*
Kevin Bernier, *Brookfield Power*
Michelle Belanger, *Whitewater Boating Specialist, Dept of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife*
Fred Candeloro, *Northern Lights ATV Club*
Rep. Roderick Carr, *Lincoln*
Diano Circo, *Natural Resources Council of Maine*
Alexandra Connover, *Willemantic*
Albro Cowperthwaite, *North Maine Woods*
Sen. Paul Davis, *Sangerville*
Steve Day, *Maine Forest Service, Greenville Office*
Pat Dorian, *Maine Warden Service*
Louis Durgin, *Dover-Foxcroft*
Paul Fichtner, *Penobscot Lake Lodge*
Bob Guethlen, *Rockwood*
Alan Hutchinson, *Forest Society of Maine*
Doug Kane, *Wildlife Biologist, IF&W Greenville Office*
Dan Legere, *Maine Guide Fly Shop*
Jennifer Mills, *Pittston Farm*
Paul Napolitano, *Ragged Riders Snowmobile Club*
Sandra Neily, *Greenville*
Tim Obrey, *Fisheries Biologist, IF&W Greenville Office*
Bill Patterson, *The Nature Conservancy*
Rep . Earl Richardson, *Greenville*
Greg Shute, *Chewonki*
Rick Sylvester, *Seboomook Wilderness Campground*

Appendix B

Summary of Planning Issues

The following is a summary of management issues raised by staff, and through public comments voiced during public meetings or submitted in writing to the Bureau (for a more complete record of comments see also Appendix C: Summary of Written Comments, as well as the meeting notes for the four public meetings held prior to this Pre-Plan, available on Bureau website.)

Seboomook and Canada Falls Parcels

Significant Natural Resources Management Issues

- Concern about the fragility of wetlands in the area and potential harm from ATVs.
- Concern about potential overuse of the area, and impact on the special character of the area.
- Invasive aquatic species are always a concern at boat launches. Finding ways to prevent the spread of these species, including educating boaters, is important to maintaining the quality of the lakes.
- The exemplary areas on the unit are all associated with wetlands. Buffers of these wetlands during timber harvests should be adequate to maintain the quality of the exemplary areas. While most of the rare plant species on the unit are also associated with wetlands, Orono sedge is found in open areas along roads. Management activities should avoid the use of herbicides that target grasses and sedges and avoid excavation in areas where Orono sedge is found.
- For all threatened and special concern wildlife species on the unit, refer to “Threatened and Endangered Species in Forests of Maine: A Guide to Assist with Forestry Activities,”

Fisheries and Wildlife Management Issues

- Development of any new recreational facilities should not be undertaken until there has been a more thorough assessment of loon nesting sites following stabilization of the water levels under the new water management regime that Great Lakes Hydro will begin to implement this year. It is not clear whether the study conducted by Biodiversity Research Institute has been completed or is ongoing into the future.
- Personal watercraft should not be allowed on any lakes where loon habitat protection is a priority.
- There is a need to increase the available dense softwood shelter in the Seboomook region given the scarcity of this forest type resulting from the spruce budworm infestation and commercial harvests. Winter cover is the limiting factor for deer populations in this area. Other softwood dependent species that would benefit from increased softwood areas include pine marten, snowshoe hare and spruce grouse. Coyote, red fox, porcupine and weasels are also residents of this habitat.
- Any winter camping areas or winter recreational trails should be located away from designated deer wintering areas.
- Any beech trees in reasonable condition should be retained for mast production for bear forage.

Historic and Cultural Resource Management Issues

- As with any land managed by the Bureau of Parks and Lands, plans for any ground disturbance should first be referred to the Maine Historic Preservation Commission who can determine if carrying out that plan would disturb any of sensitive areas.
- Archaeological resources are particularly accessible and threatened whenever water levels are low on the lakes or impoundments. Except for Seboomook Lake, which can be drawn down by 17 feet under the recent FERC hydropower license, the lakes and ponds in this unit will experience natural or near-natural water level fluctuations with a minimum potential exposure of artifacts. However, low water levels may result during periods of extreme drought.

Recreation Management Issues

Some participants expressed an interest in development of some new recreational facilities, including:

- A hiking trail along the South Branch and West Branch
- Informational brochure with information about rare plants and rare plant communities
- Improvements to the canoe portages.
- ATV trails with camping opportunities; could be multi-use trails shared with snowmobiles in the winter.
- ATV loop around Moosehead (like the Moosehead snowmobile loop)
- Back-country cross-country ski trails; some groomed. Area at north end of Seboomook and Canada Falls area are of particular interest.
- Horseback riding trails; Pittston Farm has facilities that may be developed to accommodate horseback riding interests. One of only a few places in the state where large horseback riding groups could be accommodated.
- Improved signage and information about the boat access sites (unaware that the site near Pittston Farm was a Public Boat Launch)
- Review canoe/boating put-ins and take-outs on the South Branch – are these adequate? Is parking area adequate?
- Maine Forest Service concern that riverbank near its cabin not be used as a whitewater boating take-out due to potential erosion and conflict with use of the area for a helicopter landing site.
- Are there adequate parking areas defined for the boat access sites – potential conflicts with camping and use of the area by whitewater boaters at Canada Falls dam.

Other recreation management concerns included:

- Large unit – room for both motorized and non-motorized trails. Can accommodate full diversity of recreational users.
- The NMW system does not allow bicycles, horses, or ATV's. Interest in these uses.
- Need for user-training for safety and resource protection.
- Comments favored allowing ATV's on the Unit:
 - Need to serve older and less able recreationists.
 - Concern about loss of snowmobile trails and other recreational opportunities on private lands.
 - Examine suitability of existing snowmobile trails as ATV trails.

- ATV Clubs are just forming in this area. They recognize that any ATV trails need to be supported by active clubs that will take responsibility for trail maintenance, education and training for proper use of ATV's and adherence to established trails.
- Concern about or opposition to ATV's:
 - Review the existing snowmobile trail locations (especially at Carry Brook area) to be sure they are avoiding any sensitive natural areas.
 - Concern about ATV trails in proximity to residences; some theft already from snowmobilers.
 - Opposition to allowing ATV's on the unit due to concerns with erosion, disturbance to wildlife, and intrusion upon traditional uses.
 - Findings of a recent tourism survey found people are not embracing more motorized use in this area. Is affecting quality of life.
- Interest in traditional uses, and maintaining a back-country character to the area.
 - Will there be areas without roads? Will the state consider discontinuing some roads for a more remote recreational experience?
 - What signage is adequate and compatible with the backcountry character of the area?
- Opportunity to promote use of the area. Importance of hiking and snowmobile trails to local and regional economy. Need to address public awareness about the opportunities available on these lands – interest in increasing use of the area through increased public awareness by advertising/publicizing the area.
- Need a “winter plan” that will allocate some areas for motorized use and others for non-motorized uses such as cross-country skiing, snowshoeing, winter camping. Snowmobiles now go everywhere, even where there are no groomed trails. Have seen them even in St. John Ponds area.
- Management of resources is a key to attractiveness of the area for users: use dropped when deer herd size dropped and when fishing “take” limits decreased.

Timber Management Issues

- Determine through the allocation process which forest acres will be available for timber management (timber-dominant or important secondary use)
- Develop harvest entry into the Carry Brook mature aspen stands soon after Plan adoption.
- Evaluate the condition of the extensive S1 and M1 stands which have resulted from past clearcuts.
- Determine the condition of the currently zoned deer wintering areas, to learn if they are functioning well and whether any timber harvest or other management activity is warranted in the near future.

Management Issues Related to Roads, Access, and NMW Gates

Access To and Within the Seboomook Unit

- How will the roads previously developed as woods management roads be managed?
- The current location of the gates on the road to the Socatean Ponds should be revisited.
- Given limited resources, how important is restoration of the Cutoff Road?
- Regional historical use of North Maine Woods – importance of access to roads and trails to economy of the area.
- Access to unit is important to the economy of the region.

- Concern about how the public be assured of continued access to these lands as there are not guaranteed rights over all private roads leading to the Unit.
- Condition of the roads impedes access – especially the 20-mile road from the end of the county maintained section. Part of broader issue of changing management of roads under new landowners- access is becoming more difficult.
- Will this plan deal with closure of roads on the Seboomook Unit?

NMW Gates and Fees

- Concern about the fee structure and its effect on local businesses and campowners
- Concern that fees are discouraging use. Use of NMW is very low compared to past historic use. Hardly anyone there; Canada Falls campground empty, other NMW campsites not nearly used to capacity.
- When people chose to go some other area, like New Hampshire, the state loses revenue – in retail sales, state tolls to get to the area, gas, lodging, guiding, dining. Local businesses lose business even if visitors go elsewhere in Maine.
- View that taxpayers paid for these lands and shouldn't have to pay high fees to use them.
- High fees hit the lower middle income users and retired folks hardest, and they tend to be the traditional users of this area, and account for more of the total use than folks who can afford the fees.
- Getting out of NMW is an option as the unit is on the periphery of the system, like the Nahmakanta Unit was (which was removed from the KI-Jo-Mary System).
- Gate system has benefits for providing oversight of use – registration deters vandalism. Worry about increased use in winter, without gates to provide this security - could see increased vandalism.
- Gates are not operated in the winter. If use increases in the winter, there could be increased vandalism.
- Information provided at the gate is inconsistent or incorrect at times; fees are not consistently charges; gatekeepers are at times discourteous. Need better service ethic and training.
- Impacts of not having a gate, if the unit is withdrawn from the NMW system, including whether the costs for the services now provided at the gate will have to be absorbed by Greenville taxpayers.

St. John Ponds Parcel

Significant Natural Resource Management Issues

- The St. John Ponds unit was acquired under the condition that it be managed as an Ecological Reserve. This designation requires a prohibition on timber harvesting and strict limitations on motorized recreation. Roads on the unit are currently in very poor condition.
- The exemplary ecosystem and rare plants on the unit are all associated with wetlands. Since the unit is an Ecological Reserve, protection for these areas is not a concern.

Historic and Cultural Resource Management Issues

- Spiess (2004) recommends an archaeological survey of this area, beginning with a careful walkover around the lake basins.

Recreation Management Issues

- Parking area at point of barrier for vehicular travel.
- Are there other roads or trails (besides the Gulliver Brook Road) that would provide a more suitable pedestrian access to this area?

Timber Management Issues

- Though not a timber issue per se, decisions must be made on how to manage the existing logging road access, where to block roads and where to put them to bed. Much will depend on recreational access decisions, as well as environmental threat and the expense of closure

Baker Lake Parcel

Significant Natural Resource Management Issues:

- The campsite and boat launch area on the north end of the lake shows signs of trampling and heavy use. The boat launch is unimproved, shallow, and can be difficult to use, resulting in sediment being stirred up as boats attempt to launch.
- Invasive aquatic plants are always a concern at any boat launch, and steps should be taken to educate users about the consequences of invasive species.
- Management guidelines for wood turtles and Tomah mayflies include maintaining a 330 ft. riparian management zone for 3.1 mi. (5 km) upstream and 3.1 mi. (5 km) downstream from the occurrence. “Threatened and Endangered Species in Forests of Maine: A Guide to Assist with Forestry Activities” recommends that 25 feet of the riparian zone nearest the waterway remain unharvested; the rest of the riparian zone be managed with single tree or small group selection cuts that maintain 60-70% cover; and construction of roads and log landings within the riparian management zone be avoided or minimized. In addition, MDIFW guidelines recommend avoiding the use of broad-spectrum insecticides within a ¼ mile of the stream for 0.6 mi. (1 km) upstream and 0.6 mi. (1 km) downstream of the Tomah mayfly occurrence.
- Rare plants in the unit, blue-beaked sedge (*Carex rostrata*) (ranked S2) and bog bedstraw (*Galium labradoricum*) (ranked S2?), are located within a large, non-forested wetland. These plants are probably adequately protected from forestry practices.

Fisheries and Wildlife Management Issues

- Little is known about how the presence of muskies is affecting the population of native species such as brook trout, but it is commonly accepted that brook trout populations will not fair well in the presence of muskies. Muskies are also continuing to spread throughout the St. John River watershed, and their impacts could increase as their population continues to grow. The official IFW policy calls for encouraging anglers to fish out the species, though some would be interested in maintaining muskies as a high-quality sport fishery in the lake.

Recreation Management Issues

- There has been interest expressed for a group campsite on this lake.

Administrative Management Concerns

- Access rights to Baker Lake have not been fully secured, although there has been a long tradition of public access through the North Maine Woods system and policies of the predecessor large landowners such as Great Northern Paper Company.

Big Spencer Mountain Parcel

Significant Natural Resource Management Issues

- The poorly maintained snowmobile and hiking trail that leads to the lookout tower was not designed for the kind of use it receives and is prone to erosion. If the trail continues to be used for motorized recreation, its design will need to be reassessed.
- The area surrounding the lookout tower has been trampled by visitors to the top of the mountain. Although not part of the state-owned parcel, care should be taken to ensure that this trampled area does not expand.
- As an Ecological Reserve, the unit is subject to prohibitions on timber harvest and restrictions on recreation use.

Recreation Management Issues

- Future use of the existing trail to the old warden's cabin.
- Future of the old warden's cabin.
- Need for trailhead parking, both summer and winter, for hiking trail up Big Spencer Mountain.

Appendix C
Maine Department of Conservation
Bureau of Parks and Lands
PUBLIC COMMENTS

**Summary of Written Comments on the Preliminary Plan and First Draft
of the Seboomook Unit Management Plan**

(May 23, 2005 –August 31, 2006)

(Comments may be excerpted or summarized. Typographical, grammatical, or formatting errors have been corrected where possible.)

From: Sherwin Start, Sanford (June 14-15, 2005)

Seboomook and Canada Falls Parcels:

- In-holdings: We are concerned that "In-holdings"-(Private Lands)within this unit are going to have a serious adverse affect on the States ability to effectively Manage this unit. In addition these private Parcels of Lands could at any time be subdivided into to small lots. The State should see if they can get a permanent conservation easement on all of these private lands or even purchase them. I realize that the LURC does control all development in the unorganized areas of the State.
- Horses: I have nothing against horses and neither does my wife, but there also has to be limits placed on where and when they can be allowed to go and what they are used for. Unshodded horses cause very little damage as opposed to those with hardened steel shoes. Trails must be kept at minimum pitch and on high - dry ground. Each rider should be responsible for his or her animal's dung. Horse riders should have to pay a small trail construction and maintenance fee.
- ATV's: In our opinion, seeing how much damage that ATV'S have done in SW Maine, we would recommend that NO ATV'S be allowed on any lands within this unit, until such time that hardened surface roads/trails can be built to accommodate them. If the ATV clubs want to post a construction, repair and maintenance bond and assist the State in the development and construction of ATV trails and physically assist in their maintenance as needed, then we would go along with those plans. These ATV trail locations should be very restricted, keeping in mind that resource protection is of the highest priority.
- Ecological Reserves: No ATV or snowmobile trails should be allowed in any Ecological Reserves!! We would however be in favor of developing backpacking, cross country sking and snowshoeing trails, in addition to backcountry primitive tent camping sites. Walk in-walk out and provide your own self contained cooking stoves- no camp fires of any type should be allowed!! In addition traditional hunting, fishing, trapping ,white-water rafting, and canoeing.
- Wildlife and Botanical Resources: Protection of natural communities is also critical, and there are numerous plant and animals communities that are very rare and/or protected by either State and/or Federal Laws. These must all costs be preserved in perpetuity!!
- Draw down of Canada Falls Lake is excellent right where it is and should be held at this level or even less if possible! Draw down of Seboomook Lake is going in the right direction and every effort should be made to minimize this as much as possible.
- Although in our opinion EVERY WETLAND is an important eco-system, there appear to be numerous ones in the Seboomook unit that have very special significance. These must be protected at all costs from all types of human encroachment!! There is a very serious need for a great deal more study as far as wildlife and fisheries are concerned in this unit and we whole heartedly agree that no development plans should be formulated until ALL of these studies are 100% complete!!
- Forest management: There also appears to be a need for the Professional Foresters to do an intensive compartmentalization of the Unit to bring this Unit back up to full wildlife habitat standards. Our Prescription would be for a balanced hard wood/soft wood mix where possible given the soil, water and ground conditions, especially in those areas are all bodies of water and wetlands.

- Roads: A very careful study must be undertaken by all members of the management team in determining which of the existing roads and trails are of ABSOLUTE VITAL necessity and permanently close those that are not ! All of these roads should be water barred, blocked/diked/ditched to exclude any and ALL types of motorized equipment, top-soiled, seeded /mulched and trees planted there-on.
- Mountain bikes: The use of mountain bikes should be discouraged as next to ATV's they cause unbelievable loss of soil and trail erosion and destruction, and that is a fact!
- ATV on snowmobile trails: Another thing to be VERY CAREFULL of is allowing ATV's to use Snowmobile trails! We have seen it time and again where this has happened and the outcome is devastating to the point that there is almost always total destruction of the snowmobile trail or trails.
- User Fees: Just like the US Forest Service does, charge a fee for overnight use of primitive camp sites i.e. \$5.00 per person or so. That will raise a little revenue. Have a universal State Lands Access fee much like that of the State Park System and/ or a Yearly Pass.

St. Johns Ponds Parcel.

- Again it looks like access is a big issue that needs to be dealt with. In view of the fact that this parcel is an ecological reserve there really isn't much that can be done here except for the following recommendations: Have the perimeter surveyed, boundary marked and posted with signs to the effect that "the land behind this sign property of the State of Maine-Ecological Reserve". No motor vehicles of any kind are allowed except in designated areas-ONLY!" All roads that can be used for motorized vehicular travel MUST BE PERMANENTLY CLOSED, except for a small graveled parking area on the SE corner of Third St. John Pond. From there we would want to see a foot trail only. This hiking trail could be used to access about 15 backcountry tent platforms for camping. This trail hiking and backpacking would be exactly as done on the AT. No wood fires to be built unless it is a life or death situation. A seasonal Ranger Cabin would be necessary. This cabin would be very "Rustic" and provide only the barest of amenities. Sleep 2, outside privy, meals cooked on Coleman Stove and light With Coleman lantern(s).It would not be built to be lived in during the winter. The ranger would be in attendance from May1 to October 1. No ATV's, snowmobiles, trail bikes, cross country motor bikes would be allowed except on the water(ice) portion of Third St. John Pond (snowmobilies only)!! I envision a tough time telling the snowmobilers that area is closed to snowmobiling after they have been allowed to be on it for so many years, but this the stipulation and we must follow through with it!!

Baker Lake Parcel:

- It appears to us that the Baker Lake Parcel is pretty well set other than trying to find another location for the public boat launch and closing the existing one permanently.
- Perhaps a nature scenic trail could be built around the lake? This area has a number of very rare plant communities and a few wildlife species as well that deserve our protection in perpetuity. By one means or another, we must provide the general population the opportunity to visit and experience these rare and beautiful sites and wildlife.
- The mere fact that Baker pond is home of one the VERY FEW Muskelunge fisheries west of the Ohio River, will in itself bring many thousands of anglers from all over the Region and Canada. I personally consider this a VERY IMPORTANT fishery, and instead of the IF&W trying to eliminate it, they should be encouraging it's proliferation!
- We are not in favor of "group campsites" any where around or near this Lake! If there are to be campsites here, they should be like those we proposed for the St. Johns Parcel, i.e. Carry in- Carry -out on your back - LEAVE NO TRACE Appalachian Trail type Camping only!!

Big Spencer Mountain:

- Being a Ecological Reserve, here again there isn't much to be done except close off all ATV and Snowmobile Trails that encroach into this area. Here again signs need to be posted on ALL ATV and snowmobile trails that lead into this area, that the Area IS CLOSED TO ALL MOTORIZED USE Except for those types as allowed in designated areas (Automobiles only).
- However there will always be a need for a FOOT TRAIL to the top from one or both ends. If the existing trail to the top is too far gone then close it off permanently, but not before a new for FOOT TRAVEL ONLY has been established.
- The Fire Tower and the "In-Holding" boundary should be surveyed ,marked and posted, as well as the boundary of the Ecological Reserve.
- The DOC/BPL can have the naturalists set up signs and information kiosks to educate the public on what is

allowed and not allowed and the attributes, natural communities, visual resources

- We suggest that the Old Wardens Cabin as well as the two "Squatters Cabins" be bulldozed and covered over, otherwise sooner or later someone will torch it and start a forest fire.

From: Jeff Bagley, Fisheries Biologist, IF&W Greenville (June 20, 2005)

In reviewing the (Preliminary) Plan, I have just a few comments regarding fisheries management in the Seboomook Unit.

- Fishing regulations in place for waters in the Seboomook Unit are currently meeting our management objectives.
- We feel that access such as trails and launches to waters within the Seboomook Unit are currently adequate.
- We would recommend that reasonable access fees be put in place, which will not deter or restrict anglers from fishing waters in the Seboomook Unit.
- Note: on page 22 of the Plan under bullet North Branch flow augmentation, line 3; it is stated that flow will provide another fall big river salmon fishery, this should read brook trout fishery.

From: Alexandra Conover, Guide, Willimantic (July 27, 2005)

- Regarding the Seboomook Management Plan, here are just my most important observations, coming from the perspective of a wilderness guide conducting regional and global ecotourism canoe trips in this area.
- P. 53 of the (Preliminary) Plan: "The Bureau plans to continue to improve and upgrade these roads . . . etc." These Seboomook lands are rare and unique when compared with public lands in the lower 48 states. The water is drinkable, there are wild native trout populations and wildlife is abundant. Though the woods have been harvested heavily, they are still visually pleasing from the water. Places like this are extremely rare in the U.S.
- The quickest way to change the atmosphere and character of this place is to upgrade roads and develop campgrounds and motorboat access ramps for this only attracts the least responsible type of user and eliminates the eco-tourists that are generally responsible, low impact, and prefer quiet undeveloped camping areas. The day or weekend high impact user already has the majority of Maine's public reserved lands and state parks to use, let alone all of KOA and America to drive, car camp and motor around in.
- So why are we, the state of Maine, even contemplating improving access and roads when we know from experience that it will lead to more public pressure for facilities and ultimately create more management problems? All of these "improvements" cost money and in the long run degrade the Seboomook lands to a level of use that can be found almost anywhere in America.
- Why aren't we protecting and promoting what is unique in Maine? Do we want Seboomook to become Sebago Lake? Why would anyone drive as far as Seboomook to arrive at a place that delivers an outdoor experience that can much more easily be gotten in even central Maine?
- Recommendations: Abandon the S. Seboomook road (\$17,000m proposed '05 cost) and the Cut-Off Road (\$5,000).

Reasoning: It is duplicatory. The Golden Road on the North and its two spur roads – one to Seboomook Dam and the other to both Canada Falls Dam and Kings High Landing provide ample access to the Seboomook Unit.

Result: Focused (versus scattered) specific access points which make management easier and problems fewer. The Department of Conservation saves \$22,000.

From: Jennifer Mills, Pittston Farm (July 31, 2005)

- The following are my opinions and comments regarding horseback riding and trails in the Seboomook Unit. After reviewing the Integrated Resource Policy established for parks and land use I give the following comments:
- It was clear after reviewing the policy that dispersed activity includes horseback riding, snowshoeing, nature observation and snowmobiling:
 1. Sec. 4A Policy. Sec. 23 Trail Establishment Policy: A variety of land trail opportunities will be provided on Bureau-managed land including trails for horseback riding, historic interpretation, snowmobiling, cross-country skiing, snowshoeing and canoe portage.
 2. On page 63 Sec. 25 of the plan Horseback riding shall be permitted on bureau-managed land where

guide-lines are established to ensure safety, control erosion and variety of riding opportunities.

- It is our intent to develop, hopefully along with the Bureau of Parks and Lands' assistance, bridle trails from the current discontinued wood roads near the farm. We have tentatively reviewed the area, and one road called "Windy Pitch" just down from the original "Pittston Y", across the Seboomook thoroughfare, is a nice area for riding. There are also many other wood logging roads with a few miles of the farm that will offer a variety of rides for enjoying the surrounding area. The trails include streams and a variety of terrains, flat and hilly. We have the necessary facilities for this new recreational opportunity and will be making modifications as necessary for improvements and establishment of this beginning in hopefully the 2006 summer or early fall season.
- We have done quite a lot of marketing work with various horse associations throughout Maine, New England and on the internet as well. All associations contacted have been very positive about the new recreational opportunity for horsebacking in the North Maine Woods. They have indicated their current places for riding in the southern part of the state are becoming closed or limited to them. They have told us to let them know as soon as possible when we are ready to open the riding and they will be there. Our research since last winter indicates, the opportunities are very limited for this type of horseback riding and accommodations (food and lodging for both) in our state. We discovered two or three, including Acadia National Park.
- We will be developing packages, for this activity and that will include all the necessary provisions for customers. Our barn is on the National Historic Register and we will be increasing and improving our current stalls into boxed stalls to house the horses. We also will have in residence at least one team of work horses for conducting cultural log twitching demonstrations for the farm, as well as other activities involving their traditional use. We will also have our own pleasure riding horses.
- We will be developing, marking trails and producing a map for distribution to horseback riding customers on the 44 plus acres of Pittston Farm as well as utilizing the Seboomook unit adjacent to us.
- We feel honored, and anxious to work with the State of Maine in bringing horseback riding back to this area after a long absence. It is a natural fit for Historic Pittston Farm, since historically it was the place where the "Teamsters lived, and where they cared for the horses that hauled the logs out of the woods." This lumbering occupation established Great Northern Paper Co. and our great state of Maine as a lumbering giant in the world in the 1920's. What a great opportunity to mold historic, cultural, and participatory tourism recreational activity into a great vacation of learning for our citizens and all other visitors as well.

From: Doug Kane, Wildlife Biologist, IF&W Greenville (September 7, 2005)

- The overriding wildlife issue in the Seboomook Unit is deer wintering area (DWA) management concerns. Much of the mature softwood cover type left in this unit has deer wintering activity. We have both mapped areas and areas that still need to be fleshed out and mapped.
- In addition, there is an extensive old burn site with residual birch/aspen where we hope the Bureau will move fairly soon to do some fairly heavy handed cutting to improve the area for grouse/woodcock.

From: Sandra Neily, Greenville (Sept 29, 2005)

- Could we use "people powered" in the planning document instead of non-motorized?
- Winter Remote Areas: If the intent is to "manage Canada Falls and the South Branch for a remote non-motorized winter experience," the issue of the Canada Falls Road (not owned by the state) is an important one. This might take a cooperative agreement between the state and the landowner to close or post the road during the winter (except when the road is plowed to support logging operations.) A remote-feeling and fairly quiet winter experience in this area cannot be had when sled traffic is on the Canada Falls Road . . . even if users are on a trail near the river. Sled traffic, in general, will need to be carefully managed onto a focused trail system and "people powered" recreation areas clearly marked and facilitated (roads closed and gated; parking available) in order to accommodate diverse users. (This would also apply to winter use in the St. John Ponds Parcel). Currently winter sled traffic spreads out into the entire parcel so there will be the challenge of changing some use patterns anyway.
- South Seboomook Road: I suggest that (DOC) explore the idea of putting the road south of Seboomook Lake "to bed" and reserving it as a people powered trail. This option would save significant for repair and upkeep and since we've had several seasons without it being a useful road, we know that traffic users can access the resources here as well as Seboomook Wilderness campground without the road. Closing the road

would allow the lake to offer a more remote wild-feeling experience, rather than trying to squeeze the remote land experience between two heavily used roads (Golden Road and Seboomook Road). We have an important opportunity to return this area to a more remote experience and enhance the quality of its wildlife habitat by not repairing the road where there are alternatives for access to the southern portions of Seboomook Lake and the north shores of Moosehead Lake.

- Creating a wilderness and trail matrix that supports the addition of the Big W lands: There is significant potential for a large contiguous block of wilderness lands and trail systems in this region if the Big W area can be conserved during the Plum Creek Concept Plan “opportunity.” There seems to be a consensus forming that the last remaining undeveloped shorelines on the northwest shore of Moosehead be conserved. The “line” above which future intense development will be considered unacceptable “sprawl” is very clearly drawn below these lands by all interested stakeholders at this time. Several camp owners in the region are also interested in beginning the discussion of a trail system that would offer “people powered” campsites on the lake (as well as motorized ones), a hiking/ biking trail that followed the edge of the lake (where possible) and trails that used the elevations in Big W Township for their value as remote experiences. There are ridges and views in this area that allow for varied terrain and stunning visual experiences.
- Lakeside trail: The Moosehead Region lacks a lakeside trail that connects up to remote feeling (wild feeling) experiences. The Northern Forest Canoe Trail is lacking campsites in this important leg of its trail. The entire region is lacking a high quality, destination bike trail system and by combining the Big W lands to the Seboomook lands we could achieve both high quality large landscape wildlife habitat conservation and a wilderness-type experience (a novel one that would also host the alternative snowmobile trail at the same time as that section has high value as a remote sled trail). Bike trails could access the region below the current gate and that would solve the problem of how to get “bikes” into NMW territory. This option might also reduce pressure at the gate as access to the Seboomook lands could also come through the Big W region.
- Seboomook Wilderness Campground shuttle: When I think of the campground I think of Rick (Sylvester) perhaps offering a shuttle for his campers across the cove to hike, bike, or kayak into this remote system and I see a shuttle operation that would daily drop people (and their canoes, kayaks or bikes) either at the southern end of Seboomook Lake to explore it for the day or across the cove to explore the Big W lands and trails. This is the kind of experience that gets written up in Outside and Backpacker magazines because the experience is so unusual and high quality.

From: Dan Legere, Guide, Greenville (Oct 8, 2005)

- I am pleased with your Proposed Vision for the Management of the Seboomook Unit. Although I was in favor of the North Maine Woods gate being moved beyond the Pittston Farm, (one of my main concerns was free and easy access for the public to the unit), I believe the proposed arrangement you outlined allowing free access to the unit is great and keeping the North Maine Woods gate at 20 mile could work very well. The voucher system will be a good way to inform the public they are getting something for their tax dollars. It would appear that the concerns from the private businesses have been taken into account. They should be pleased.
- I didn’t see anything about allowing mountain bikes or ATV’s through the gate onto state lands. Has this been addressed?
- I’m fine with the Big Spencer Mountain draft allocations. It would be nice if there was a snowmobile trail developed to a vista on the parcel if allowed at all. What are the unauthorized structures on the southern edge of the property?
- I am definitely in favor of pursuing the possibility of more remote water access camp sites on Canada Falls. It’s a beautiful place well suited for remote recreational use.
- I have serious concerns about developing a large campsite for extensive ATV use on the Seboomook Unit. While driving to the East Outlet of the Kennebec River each day to guide fishermen I get a chance to view the ATV trail, governed by a club, that goes along Route 6 for a stretch before the river. It is truly nothing more than a muddy rutted mess that can’t be healthy for the land around it. If it was state land it would be shut down. I can only assume that if ATV use is allowed off the established road system problems will surface.
- One final note of appreciation for you and your dedicated staff professionals. If I had a large tract of land I could only hope that I would care for that as well as the Bureau of Parks and Lands watches over our public

lands for us and the next generation.

From: Jym St. Pierre, RESTORE (Oct 8, 2005)

- There appear to be many good aspects to the 9/13/05 draft resource allocations. However, I am concerned that
- There are only two areas totaling 465 acres in the Seboomook Lake Parcel where Special Protection would be the dominant use.
 - There are no areas in the Canada Falls-South Branch Parcel where Special Protection would be the dominant use.
 - The size of the area in the Baker Lake Parcel where Special Protection would be the dominant use is not specified.
 - There are no areas listed for ecological reserves in the Seboomook Lake, Canada Falls-South Branch, and Baker Lake Parcels. Would the areas identified for Special Protection officially become ecoreserves?

From: Sherwin Start, Sanford (Oct 15, 2005)

- I have reviewed your proposed draft of the Seboomook Management Plan. It is a very well thought out Plan except for one area-ATV'S ! ATV'S are going to literally destroy the Wilderness aspect for both wildlife and humans!! Allowing ATV'S, and enforcing their compliance will cost the DOC a great deal of money and manpower and WILL require that a Ranger be on duty YEAR-ROUND !!! Also allowing ATV'S is going to create a problem with our neighbor, namely NMW and other land owners such as Plum Creek!! My wife is a Wildlife Conservationist and I am a Natural Resource Conservationist. If ATV'S are going to be allowed in Seboomook, we WILL NOT be visiting that Area!!

From: Christopher Silsbee, Caribou (Oct 26, 2005)

- I have read the plan and found it to be very informative and well organized. I was glad to see some of the suggestions that were made by the general public in the plan and appreciate how the State has taken the time to hear public comments and listen to concerns at the public meetings that were held.
- I believe this plan is a good foundation for the management of this area. I just hope that as the unit is developed some of the expressed interest in new recreational facilities is reviewed. The plan really addresses the recreation and visual consideration of the unit but with a strong support of special protection with the help of the designated wildlife management areas. With a unit this size, the multi-use concept will be successful if this plan is carried out.
- I'm pleased that the state is continuing to acquire new lands as they come available and is dedicated to promote recreational activities while at the same time manage these lands correctly for the enjoyment of future generations.

From: Alan Hutchinson, Forest Society of Maine (Oct 31, 2005)

- The Forest Society of Maine extends its compliments to the Department of Conservation, Bureau of Parks and Lands for its work in developing the management plan for the Seboomook Unit, which includes Big Spencer Mountain. The Forest Society of Maine (FSM) made substantial investments of funds, time, and other resources in conserving these lands as part of the West Branch Campaign, in partnership with the state, and have a long-term commitment to ensuring appropriate management and stewardship of these lands. We feel that the draft plan captures the intent of the West Branch project, addresses the key ecological and recreational issues, and balances the various uses (ecological, recreational, cultural, and sustainable forestry) in a manner that fits FSM's understanding and view of this parcel and the region. Within the draft plan, however, there are several specific questions, issues, or observations that FSM wishes to submit for consideration as you work on the final draft that will be presented at public meetings. They are as follows:
- Introductory Statements: It seems that some form of introductory paragraph would be appropriate explaining the origins of this parcel as part of the larger West Branch project and the significant role the Forest Society of Maine played in conserving these lands. For example, Big Spencer Mountain was conserved by a \$3 million private fundraising campaign done by FSM. We then gave the mountain to the state as an ecological reserve. Mention could also be made that the West Branch project protected 329,000 acres in total: 282,000 acres under FSM easement and 47,000 as state fee lands, and that they are linked geographically and via the

state's recreational access easement that FSM donated.

- The 240-acre Mud Cove Bog: It is appropriately identified in the plan as a Special Protection area. This area was acquired earlier and separate from the larger parcel. At that time there was some thought that it should be larger than 240 acres we were able to buy at that time, to include some additional older stands of timber (primarily spruce, I think). Your staff has probably already done so, but the boundaries as shown on the map should be verified to insure that the older timber was adequately considered, and that it is not focused solely on the rare plant wetlands.
- Jet Ski ban on Baker Lake: The draft plan recommends that BPL pursue a ban on personal watercraft use on Seboomook Lake, primarily due to the nesting loon population and their special status due to the North Cape funding. Pursuing a similar ban for Baker Lake was proposed by some at the September advisory group meeting due to a general sense that they would be inappropriate in that North Woods setting. FSM urges BPL to pursue it due to nesting loons and the North Cape funding, as well. Baker Lake was one of the identified loon nesting lakes in the surveys.
- Forestry and wildlife management: The draft plan states one of the forestry goals for wildlife was to manage for ruffed grouse and woodcock habitat, with a special focus within some of the old aspen stands – especially in the Carry Brook region. FSM expresses our support for that management goal.
- Socatean Pond: Is Socatean Pond a designated Remote Pond (if not, does it warrant that level of recognition), and have local fisheries biologists been asked if the draft management recommendations adequately address the fisheries values?
- Big Spencer Mountain: FSM has a couple of concerns/questions:
 1. BPL is recommending that snowmobiling be discontinued from the trail to the Ranger's cabin. The draft plan recommends the state pursue an alternative, high-vista destination trail if the Big Spencer trail is eliminated. FSM adds its support to the goal of DOC securing an alternative if the Big Spencer trail is discontinued.
 2. The plan recommends that the Ranger's Cabin be "removed" – we assume meaning torn down or burned. FSM supports the recommendation to remove the ancillary shed, but we are strongly opposed to removing the Ranger's cabin. The cabin is of historic significance and adds to the cultural history and experience of Big Spencer. We strongly urge DOC to not remove the cabin, at least not at this time. During the analysis of Big Spencer Mountain as an ecological reserve that led to the FSM capital campaign to acquire the mountain and give it to the people of the state of Maine, the cabin was viewed as compatible with the ecological values to be protected, and in fact was viewed as a positive attribute to the property and worthy of protection. It should not be removed and alternatives should be explored to maintain it and to use its potential as a historic way station along the trail. Consideration should also be given to allowing some vegetation management nearby the cabin for the purpose of maintaining the view from the cabin.
 3. The fire tower. This is not mentioned in the plan since it is not on the state property, but perhaps we need to be paying attention to its future as well. Like the Ranger's cabin it provides a window to the historic past of Maine's North Woods and a unique destination viewing opportunity.

From: Suzanne AuClair, Rockwood (Oct 31, 2005)

Below are comments submitted for the Seboomook Unit:

- Canoe/Small boat launch/Campsites: Establish some other public campsites and a primitive boat/canoe launch site along the piece of the south shore of Seboomook Lake that extends from Pittston Farm to Seboomook Dam. We're not sure how it is currently being used.
- Horse trails: We oppose the establishment of horse trails on public trust lands. Allow private business to conduct private business and profit off of their on their own land. Future Unit plans should include the elimination of private in-holdings within the public trust unit.
- Kings High Landing: The current number of campsites at Kings Landing is more than sufficient. It is not a good site to designate for group camping. It absolutely should not be considered as a dedicated camping area for ATV groups. It is a wildlife sensitive area, especially known for waterfowl and eagles. Large group camping would negatively impact the wildlife by its proximity to high/loud human use. We use this area every year, at different times of the seasons, so have observed the kind of human and animal traffic this area receives. Each time, we have either been the sole people there or there have been perhaps two campsites being used. To date, the number of campsites are very suitable to the amount of use and requires no change. The sites are also well appointed and well maintained. It is an excellent spot to promote a remote camping

experience. Designated group sites would fare better located close to or at already established busy sites, such as at Canada Falls, Seboomook and Roll Dams. Kings Landing would be better suited to be managed with some protection and the continued wise use of its natural resources.

- We very much appreciate the thoughtful manner by which the Seboomook Unit vision is being treated. It is, and hopefully will continue to be, quite an unencumbered area, a prime part of traditional Maine.

From: Diano Circo, Natural Resources Council of Maine (Oct 31, 2005)

- The Natural Resources Council of Maine (Council) supports many of the recommendations and prescriptions proposed in the draft Plan. There are some areas where we would like to clarify our support and offer additional comments.
- The Council supports the draft proposal's management recommendations for the Big Spencer Mountain Parcel. Specifically, we strongly support discontinuing the snowmobile trail up Big Spencer Mountain and the removal of the warden's cabin. As was mentioned at the Advisory Committee meeting, motorized use of this trail is not in keeping with the spirit of Spencer Mountain's Ecological Reserve status.
- We are also supportive of the recommendation to pursue a ban on personal watercraft for Seboomook Lake and Canada Falls Lake. Considering the specific emphasis on loon protection we think is also makes sense to pursue a personal watercraft ban on Baker Lake. Baker is relatively easily accessible by road and an important starting point for the St. John paddle trip. In time Baker could see increased pressure from personal watercraft. Pursuing a ban now may prevent future conflicts.

From: Alexandra Conover, Guide, Willimantic (Nov 4, 2005)

- The Seboomook Unit can be readily managed through default (whatever happens, happens, and we'll manage the Unit accordingly) or through careful considered thoughts as to what we want Seboomook to be 50 years from now. Will Seboomook be more like Baxter Park (Ppeople powered access and high quality wilderness experience) or more like the lower (below Rip Dam) West Branch Project (motor accessible and roadside, theme park feeling)?
- Maine, and in particular, this Seboomook region, is one of the last places in this part of the world with a relatively wild area that can currently support multi-day water/woods based adventure tourism.
- If we let Seboomook go the way of most of the other 34 state parks and 29 public reserved lands, we will continue to manage for everyone and therefore no one. Use of remoter parcels such as this one will continue to fall off.
- To increase use of an area we have to have something clearly defined to the marker of users. Is this a hunting game park? A remote flyfishing paradise? A family friendly remote North Woods heritage camping destination? An ATV theme park? If we encourage all of the above, Seboomook will never be known for anything in particular and therefore marketing the Unit will be difficult.
- As a wilderness guide, having brought people canoeing and snowshoeing in the Maine woods for over thirty years, I cannot fail to notice that our guests have sought out Maine as a destination precisely because of its remote woodlands and waterways, not because of easy access to these places. Why? Because the world, not just New England or the lower 48 states, is rapidly running out of this globally valued commodity. And so is Maine.
- Recommendation: Manage the Seboomook Unit waterways for quiet and heritage-based recreation: wildlife viewing, whitewater sports, kayaking, canoeing, fishing, hunting, trapping, snowshoeing, etc. This would mean no motorized vehicles on any of the waterways (frozen or open) within the unit: no ATV's, snowmobiles, boats, vehicles, jet skiis, etc. Reasoning: We need Seboomook to stand out from all other state managed units. Right now it has the capacity to be unique in its remoteness and undeveloped character. For much of the year it can presently deliver to eco-tourists. However, nearly every other state managed unit in Maine can only deliver motorized or road-edge camping. Another reason for managing Seboomook for people-powered eco-tourism activities is we wilderness guides do not have even one multi-day use area free of motors for our guests. People-powered recreation and motorized waterway recreation do not mix.
- I believe we have a golden opportunity to respond to the global eco-tourism market. This would put Seboomook in the forefront of what could become the first of many backcountry remote units managed for family heritage camping and remote heritage hunting, trapping, and fishing activities.

From: Tim Obrey, Regional Fisheries Biologist, IF&W Greenville (Dec 2, 2005)

- IFW supports the draft plan and vision distributed by DOC in 9/05. We support the concept (and legislative mandate) of managing State lands for multiple use recreation.
- IFW would oppose making Seboomook and Canada Falls a non-motorized zone in the summer. These are large lakes that can sustain both motorized and non-motorized recreation. In the next several years we expect that GLHA will improve the existing boat launch facilities at the dam site on Canada Falls Lake and at Kings High Landing and the dam site on Seboomook as part of the relicensing agreement.
- The concept of making the South Branch/Canada Falls area a non-motorized zone in the winter months makes good sense. This will not impact existing, traditional uses as long as the snowmobile trail can be relocated.
- IFW would like to maintain 2wd vehicle access to Kings High Landing, Seboomook Dam, Roll Dam, and the Burbank Campsites. The West Branch below Seboomook Dam has a very important wild salmon and trout fishery. Access has traditionally been via walk-in trails from the Seboomook Rd (section above Roll Dam) and drive to campsites at Roll Dam and Burbank. Blocking access to these sites would virtually eliminate fishing opportunity. It is unrealistic to expect recreational anglers to paddle from Seboomook Dam downstream to fishing sites through this very rugged/steep section. Roll Dam is also a put-in location for canoers who prefer flat water paddling and are traveling down the West Branch to Chesuncook Lake. Roll Dam is also a take-out for recreational whitewater canoers/ kayakers who prefer the upper reaches of the river. Anglers also motor up to the Burbank area from Lobster Trip and from the Foxhole during the fall to fish.
- The road along the south side of the river has been in rough shape for the passed few years. This represents lost opportunities for recreational use in the Unit and it should be rectified as funds become available.
- I would also like to express our support for the concept of a multi-use trail (motorized and non-motorized) that could possibly connect Greenville -Kokadjo-Seboomook-Rockwood. Clearly, there is a current demand for this type of opportunity in this region.

From: Dan Legere, Guide, Greenville (Dec 16, 2005)

- (Regarding the letter from Sandra Neily dated Sept 29, 2005) I have to disagree with shutting down the road to Seboomook because of very possible negative effects it might have on the (Seboomook Wilderness) campground. I as well as anyone appreciate the need to protect remote areas, but I could only support the closing of the road if Seboomook Campground supported it. These points are valid but not at someone else's expense. That access has been there since I was a kid in the 60's if not before. Being a business person myself I find it hard to swallow efforts of people who want my life to change because they think they know what is best for me. If they want things to be their way let them buy it and run it the way they think it should be.
- The Conover letter (Nov 4, 2005) also has great merit and a wonderful vision but I too use the West Branch Waterway quite a bit, especially in the fall during the spawning run of salmon. In my lifetime small motors have been very much a part of tradition. As in the Allagash, the canoe with a small motor has allowed outfitters to get people and gear in and out in a timely fashion. There are many folks who are not physically able to paddle long distances. If all the folks who motor in and out for the traditional fall salmon fishery below Lobster Lake in September had to paddle in and out it would end the trip for most who have been going there their entire lives. They would be crushed. These people are having their ashes spread there. I have been doing trips there for 22 years and the canoe with a small motor is as much a tradition as the paddle and pole.
- I understand the Lobster Lake issue and have always supported a limited horsepower on the waterway. There are camps on Lobster who need boats and motors to get provisions and gear in to their places. The decision was made not to change things because of hardships it would cause. It is unfortunate that everyone is not as courteous as they should or could be.
- I guess all of my feelings in regards to these issues stem from my belief of not intentionally depriving folks of ways of life they have become custom to. If there are real environmental issues that's different. This is about the people of the State of Maine, many of which may not agree with the wishes of special interests who believe their ways are the best for everyone. In the total package there is a lot of land set aside for people power that has been traditionally remote and desires to stay that way.

From: Kevin Bernier, Great Lakes Hydro – Brookfield Power (May 24, 2006)

- In addition to ownership of the dam lots and retention of flowage rights, in general GLHA owns the islands, lake beds, and a 10-foot shoreline area above the high water mark at both Seboomook and Canada Falls lakes. Although GLHA agrees that these lands should be described within the Plan (since they are embedded within the Seboomook Unit), these areas are subject to state (LURC) and federal (FERC) regulation, and thus, should not be included as areas to be managed by the Plan. For example, GLHA does not believe that the Plan can prevent boat launch construction (on GLHA land) if it is within a certain distance of a loon nest (which would also be on GLHA land). Such restrictions should only pertain to the State's Seboomook Unit land.
- GLHA has retained, through deeded rights, perpetual access easements for passage over and across all roads and paths as they currently exist (or as they may exist) within the Seboomook Unit. Management of the Seboomook Unit must recognize these deeded access rights.
- North Maine Woods has operated and maintained GLHA's campgrounds within and near the Seboomook Unit for a number of years at no cost to GLHA. Should the State take over this campground oversight, GLHA would request a similar agreement.
- Since Canada Falls and Seboomook are regulated by FERC, public access must be retained to the projects.
- Boat launches and portage trail upgrades embedded within the Seboomook Unit are currently being designed as required by the Storage Project FERC license. Any comments or revisions to these designs must be made through the appropriate FERC approval and LURC permitting processes.
- Subject to the comments provided above, GLHA supports the vision, goals, and recommendations for the Seboomook Unit.

From: Sandra Neily, Greenville (June 1, 2006)

- Thank you for the opportunity to comment on what is already fine work: more detailed and thoughtful recreation planning compared to previous management plans. I'm sure that reflects the increased demands on our public lands and your willingness to respond to this challenge.
- Clearly we need to plan in detail for ski and backcountry people-powered areas, and I want to highlight what you told me after the meeting as it made everything very clear to me and suggested the direction we might pursue. You said that the planning for parks (re; signage, trail use, detailed designations of various recreation areas) has always reflected intense use in a smaller area. Planning for larger public lands parcels has not, in the past, been subject to this kind of planning but it may be time to do just that on this parcel. In other words, use your department's expertise on park recreation and management and apply it to this plan, clearly designating (and creating signage) for various defined uses. Perhaps some public lands units coming into the system need to be managed like parks. This is a good time to think of this region as a large park and manage it as such as it does sustain (and will attract) significant use.
- Dave mentioned that few skiers used the area now and that without that demand we might just see what develops. I explained that (especially for winter use) skiers would not venture into areas already staked out by current and intense snowmobile use. (Bob Guethlen spoke up and also supported that observation.) Once you designate areas that will be reserved only for people powered use and sign (and protect) these areas appropriately (as in current Park management), skiing and snowshoeing users will find and use these areas. It really is a chicken and egg thing; you make room and "quiet space" for these activities and users will use them. Backcountry users will not seek out and push their way into an area already staked out by machine users and then ask for special consideration. And in the spirit of balanced opportunity (not numbers), even if only several hundred skiers or snowshoe users are counted on these trails in a season, that would not be enough rationale to exclude their trail needs from the planning process.
- I repeat my request to have Parks and Land work out a cooperative road agreement with the landowner of the Canada Falls road so that access to the lake can be reserved for people powered use in the winter (except when the landowner needs to plow the road for timber operations). This road use should be signed at all access locations, notifying users that the road is reserved for people powered use. Skiers should be able to ski from Pittston Farm to Canada Falls without sled traffic, ruts (road is not groomed), and noise. Sled traffic can easily access the lake at other points. It may be time to get creative and create signs that are not negative, like

"Road (Trail) Reserved for Quiet Winter Sports of Skiing and Snowshoeing.

Snowmobiles, Please Use Alternative Routes.

Thank you for Supporting Various Uses of Our Public Lands.”

- This same kind of signage should be used for the St. John Ponds...but add hiking to create an all season sign. Please create summer and winter parking at the St. John trail head and block the road with boulders or other barriers so that it is clearly not accessible to sled traffic.
- I also suggest that the network of woods roads and trails directly across the river confluence and east from Pittston Farm be reserved for people powered use. Access and parking can be just north of the bridge that crosses the North Branch. (Unofficially, people can cross the ice to find the trails.) This is a fine network of trails and could easily be signed from the current access points at the bridge, Golden Road and at the lake where sleds now access the trails.
- What other areas should receive the same degree of careful management? How can we use the woods roads designation process to also support these recreational activities...rather than just let the scene up there evolve?
- I would like to see the same careful consideration given to people powered recreation that I see in the thoughtful consideration to the snowmobile community. I am suggesting that planning here be very cognizant of how market driven motorized use is and how that creates an imbalance of focus and planning resources. With attention, designation and signage, we can easily respond to the needs of people powered users.
- I also wish to support Diano Circo's suggestion that we create a time limit for continuing to allow sleds on the Spencer Mountain reserve.
- The west shore of Moosehead could use hand carry boat access but we should be very careful that it is extremely limited (to small boats and small impact) and that it does not introduce new uses to the area, increase traffic substantially, or create a situation that can be used as a rationale to extend development further into lands adjacent to the Seboomook parcel. Please work with the Northern Forest Canoe Trail and other stakeholders to locate this kind of opportunity so that it does not degrade the current remote feeling qualities of this area.

From: Bob and Diane Guethlen, Rockwood (August 3, 2006)

- We are deeply concerned with the possible snowmobile trail that will be allowed in the Big Spencer Mountain ecological reserve from the perimeter road up to the warden's cabin. The language in the current draft (4.28/06, page 25) leaves too much ambiguity about when, if ever, and how the trail would be disallowed in the future. We feel that the DOC should not allow this snowmobile trail at all. The cabin should be removed and the trail rebuilt to a hiking trail standard, one that is compatible with the ecological reserve standards. If an ecological reserve is to have the highest protection, then this precedent for a temporary trail will start us down the road to a permanent trail that will become impossible to remove at a future date. The prudent course is to disallow it now. The motor vs non-motor debate will continue. It is important that DOC delineate which uses are appropriate for each use. As you know all places are not appropriate for all uses.

From: Paul Napolitano, North Yarmouth (May 12, 2006)

- On the overall Seboomook plan, generally I think you have a good plan in place. With a little fine tuning, the plan will work for the majority of the Maine people.
- On the remote sites, basically I think they will take care of themselves as long as there are no facilities for people to get gas and food. The parcels are so remote that people will not be able to get to them without motors.
- On the Spencer Mountain parcel, particularly the rangers cabin and snowmobile trail, I understand that in an eco reserve there can be no motorized vehicles and buildings. I attended the very first meeting between the Forest Society of Maine and invited guests. At that time, Alan Hutchinson's representative expressed their views to keep the cabin and the snowmobile trail as it is today. I know saving the cabin is a high priority for Alan and I would recommend removing a small parcel from the eco reserve so that this could happen. This would allow the snowmobilers and the hikers to rebuild a suitable trail to the cabin and allow the Forest Society of Maine to rebuild the rangers cabin.

Summary of Written Comments from

Scoping Sessions and Issue Focus Meetings

(AUGUST 31, 2004, OCTOBER 12, 2004, DECEMBER 6, 2004, MARCH 23, 2005)

(Not including comments related to NMW management of the 20-Mile Gate. Comments excerpted or summarized.

Typographical, grammatical, or formatting errors have been corrected where possible.)

From: Gary and Joyce Day, Pittston Academy Grant (August 20, September 8, November 22, 2004)

- This is such a large area and could still be called one of the last frontiers; we would love to see it remain as much a wilderness as it is today. One way to help accomplish this is to maintain some form of a checkpoint system, and require a persons name, address, and license plate number to control vandalism.
- This would be an area to restrict ATV's. Please don't let this area go the way the Spring Lake-Dead River area did years ago. My parents used to go there but soon the rowdiness and lack of respect took over and that is why we are in this lovely region.
- I live on the east end of the Cut-Off Road. This road has a history of bad washouts every spring. I think your money could be better spent maintaining the Seboomook Road and Roll Dam Road through to Northeast Carry. It was mentioned that the intersection of the 20-Mile Road and the South Seboomook Road is unsafe, especially if there is any wood being hauled on these roads. I'm sure the corner could be widened cheaper than maintaining the Cut-Off Road.

From: Norm Poirier, Ragged Riders Snowmobile Club (Sept. 16, 2004)

- It has come to the attention of the snowmobile club that the Spencer Mountain area has recently been designated as an ecological sanctuary, with the possibility of snowmobile access being denied. We must stress that the Spencer Mountain trail system is a very crucial link to everyone who snowmobiles anywhere in the surrounding area, from Kokadjo to Pittston Farms, Northeast Carry, Chesuncook, and Caribou Lakes. Campowners, cross country skiers as well as snowmobiles use these trails to gain access to otherwise inaccessible areas.
- The old ranger's cabin on the mountain is often a fun destination for families wanting to share the history and beauty with their children. Our club has expressed an interest in helping to maintain the historical cabin and keep the trail open for everyone to enjoy year round. We are therefore requesting that the State of Maine not refuse access to a very crucial part of the State, and let it remain open to all types of recreation.

From: Shirley A. Raymond, Raymond's Store, North East Carry (Oct.15, 2004)

- The old original road between North East Carry and Seboomook needs maintenance.

From: Rick and Jeanine Sylvester, Seboomook Wilderness Campground and Store (Oct.12, 2004)

- If one of the goals of the Department of Conservation is to promote people coming to the Seboomook Unit, then the roads must be kept up.
- The Short Cut Road was closed two years ago because of poor maintenance. This short cut road has been the main mode of travel for customers and camp owners to Seboomook for over 40 years. For short term planning we urge the Department to give this road a high priority.
- Also for the short term, meaning before freeze up this fall, it is imperative that some work be done on the Seboomook Road. There are about a dozen culverts that are not working and must be replaced before winter. If they are not replaced, next spring the road will disappear costing the Department and taxpayers dearly.
- The Gate on the Gulliver Brook Road I'm told is 5 or 6 miles from the resource protection area it is supposed to protect. One can only assume it was put there for the convenience of the landowner. This gate is now part of the Seboomook Unit and should be removed and put closer to the area it is supposed to protect. Maine people have paid dearly for this Seboomook Unit and close attention should be paid to ensure their access is not restricted in any way.
- There are many policies of the North Maine Woods that need to be addressed. Some are bicycles, ATV's, so-called over length campers, horses, to name a few. How many times have you seen a camper or motorhome with a bicycle

or two strapped to it? At the (NMW) gate they confiscate them or refuse our customers entry. This is old paper company policy and has no place in the West Branch Project or Seboomook Unit. Horses are another issue. We see no reason why horses should not be allowed. Horses were an important part of history throughout the North Maine Woods. The Seboomook Unit would be a great place for folks to come and enjoy riding.

From: Bruce Pratt, Eddington (October 12, 2004)

- Maine has a historical (social) contract with all of our citizens regarding access to state owned lands. Or those lands over which the state has been granted easements. What is the state doing charging a toll, actually a head tax, for access to the West Branch Region? Why must I pay to get to my own property when passing over state lands?
- Fees have discouraged my brother and many like him from coming to Maine to visit us. Maine loses tourism dollars as a result. This is costing our state real revenue.

From: Bruce Marcoux (October 12, 2004)

- Each year I pay 7% tax of \$87.50 to the State of Maine for my rental site at Seboomook Campground. I feel this tax is more than enough for me and my family and guests to have to pay for the right to cross, hunt, fish or recreate on State owned land.
- Pay gates should have no place on land of participating tree growth landowners. I ask the Department of Conservation to be a leader in this access issue and help Maine people gain access they are already paying for.

From: Paul Johnson, (retired) IF&W Regional Manager, Greenville (Oct 13, 2004)

- I am an advocate for gates at the access points to the Seboomook Unit as a means to manage recreation. The cost issue can be worked out.

From: Greg Shute, Chewonki Foundation (Dec. 7, 2004)

- In addition to Chewonki, Outward Bound also regularly travels through Seboomook. Currently all the campsites have road access and although they are wonderful sites they don't work well from the perspective of the canoe tripper who is seeking a more remote experience. The North Branch of the Penobscot is another place that water access campsites might be explored from Big Bog to Seboomook. Currently all the campsites in that area are road access.
- Chewonki's whitewater kayaking groups that are based at our Big Eddy Campground during the summer regularly visit the Seboomook rapids below the lake and beginning next summer will spend time on the South Branch of the Penobscot on the recreational whitewater releases from Canada Falls Dam. Again I think that some campsites on the South Branch might be interesting to consider.

From: Bob and Diane Guethlen, Rockwood (Mar 7, 2005)

- Regarding recreational uses of these lands, it is important to reach a fair balance of uses.
- All uses are not compatible on all lands. Areas should be set aside for people powered trails.
- I suggest a pamphlet be generated by the state that identifies rare plants and gives general information on them. This will enhance the knowledge of locals and visitors alike, and will help enhance softer tourism.
- The Maine Natural Areas biologist should coordinate with the snowmobile coordinator to ensure trails (particularly the Carry Brook Trail) do not adversely impact the health of these plants.
- Access to First and Second St. Jon Ponds, being in an ecological reserve, should be by foot only, with parking areas located off-site.
- Build or improve on fishing trails to create a path along the South Branch, from Canada Falls to Pittston Farm, and the West Branch, from Seboomook Dam to Roll Dam campsite.
- We suggest that the existing trail (up Big Spencer Mountain) from the logging road be maintained (or rebuilt if necessary) as a hiking trail to the cabin. A parking area should be located at the bottom of the trail for car parking in the summer and snowmobile parking in the winter. From this parking area people could hike in the summer and snowshoe in the winter to the cabin or mountain top.

From: Sandra Neily, Greenville (March 25 and 29, 2005)

- There has been an imbalance for many years (I and many others feel this way) with thousands of roads changing the interior character of the forest, shorelines being developed, snowsleds and ATV's and jetskis able to go everywhere. We need to address the past gaps in planning and have some catch-up with people powered backcountry recreation as an officially planned for sector.
- It's important to hear the Conovers when they testify that they have to take clients to Canada to find trips where they can pursue traditional environments that are motor free. They also can witness this gradual but serious loss of experience over time....and it is a loss. We have to really look for places to have quiet recreation where the sounds and smells...the experienceare not affected by motors.
- In the case of ATV's it is not just the experience, but also the resources, that are being damaged. Unregulated but market driven ATV use can totally destroy a recreation resource (example cited Roach River).
- Since snowsleds are encountered everywhere in this area, not just on groomed trails, there will have to be marked and signed people powered areas (trails and old roads) reserved for skiing and snowshoeing, just as there will need to be areas like that in the summer.
- Perhaps the St. John Ponds area and the north end of the North Branch below the bridge and the north side of the lake and Seboomook Lake itself could be people powered. Seboomook Lake should be snowsled free as the noise affects the skiing on the north side. One could ski from Pittston (or the bridge over the North Branch) all over the lands and shores on the north side of the lake.
- There needs to be winter parking off the Golden Road for skiers to access the St. Johns pond.
- The St. John Ponds area could be ungroomed, but other trails could be groomed. The regular trail groomer up there could easily groom out some ski trails, don't need "set" tracks for that to work. Would be ski skate heaven I'm sure.
- On Canada Falls, in the winter machines could have the west shore, the road up to the campground could be people powered, and the lake itself could be open to all use. That's a great ski up from Pittston but it is now a sled highway.
- In summer Seboomook Lake is an ideal canoe and recreational kayak haven. Perfect for that as the lake is mostly inhospitable to motors of any size. Remote campsites could also be on the north shore, not just on islands near the west end that have more road noise. Put in off the road right across from Nulhedus Stream. Hand carry only, please.
- I encourage you to use the "people powered" label.

From: Roger and Suzanne AuClair, Rockwood (March 31, 2005)

- We would like to see continuation of traditional Maine recreational uses at Seboomook, including small, discrete campsites for camping, hunting, fishing, canoeing, hiking, and wildlife watching.
- The Unit may need more water access.
- In general, we want to see the Seboomook reserve remain simple, quiet and natural for all persons to enjoy, as well as to conserve the important natural wildlife habitat and high quality of the resources.
- We do not want to see ATVs, personal watercraft, increased signage and "groomed" landscape, proliferation of large, motorized sport vehicles and motor homes (RVs), more services, such as attendants and long parking areas, bicycles, or more, wider, or paved roads.
- We are opposed to the introduction of ATV use because ATVs are destructive to land, waters and habitat; create loud noise and pollution; erode trails and create high maintenance needs; and will throw off the balance between motorized and non-motorized use of the woods. The constant whine of machines will occur at the busiest times of the year, when the reserve is being used by the highest number of people. Wide use/groups of ATV users will disrupt wildlife, especially in summer, when young are being raised and wildlife are roaming territory. It may result in young being separated from adults, becoming vulnerable to predation. In general, in the spring, summer and fall the woods are more fully used by more people and more animal activity than in the winter. If bands of ATV's are allowed in the public reserve, it will cost exponentially – in erosion, maintenance, balance, use, wildlife and plant habitat, quality of experience, the numbers of people who come to use the reserve, and financially.

From: Christopher Silsbee, Caribou (Mar 29, 2005)

- I'm a firm believer of the multi-use concept for managing lands. Recreation has changed dramatically and will continue to do so. We as a state need to supply the demand of what the people are looking for.
- Seboomook Lake and down to Canada Falls should be added on to the PRC.
- Campsites should be provided on Seboomook Lake.

- Hiking trails should be made to allow people to walk along the South Branch. In the winter months the same trail could be used for cross-country skiers.
- There should be a trail system created that will accommodate cross-country skiers in the winter and hikers/bikers in the summer months.
- It would be a good idea to create one ATV trail through the Seboomook Unit to connect Rockwood, Kokadjo, and Greenville. Campsites should be designed along this trail for these users.
- There should be a gate system at 20 mile but be controlled by the park system and use park receptionists to collect fees, record users and educate users coming in during peak season. Fees should be collected as they are for any park systems in the state.
- To help enforce rules and regulations on this stretch of the PRC a ranger should be added to this area, stationed right at Seboomook Lake, and work year round to help maintain a presence for the state, groom trails for winter use, educate users, and assist where problems arise.

From: Paul A. Fichtner, Penobscot Lake Lodge (April 1, 2005)

- I am very interested in keeping gates. I have lived in the woods since 1975 and have seen it both ways, with and without gates. Please keep the gates. Move them and adjust the fees if necessary, but please do not remove the gates. There is accountability when someone passes through the gates.
- If ATV's are allowed in these woods, there will be consequences. I am a motor sports dealer in Greenville. I gave up selling Arctic Cat ATVs years ago because of the sensitive ecological areas of this region. In the Seboomook Unit, there is a tremendous amount of wetland that will be permanently altered if access by ATV is allowed. I have never known any operator of an ATV to stay on a designated trail. They will travel off to explore and the very nature of these machines is destructive to sensitive soils and vegetation. I fly over this country almost every day in the non-winter months and can tell you with a large degree of certainty that there is standing water covering the majority of earth all over the region. Snowmobiles are a different story. They travel off trail and if behaved, clues of their presence are few.
- I feel strongly that given the state of the State, we don't have the funds to develop ATV trails and then be in a position to enforce the regulations. If the gates are opened and ATV's are allowed, the face of the area will be changed forever.
- In closing, I would opt for extremely restricted use of ATV's, if at all, and the continuation of the gates.

From: Sherwin and Carolyn Start, Sanford (April 21 and 24 2005)

- We are very much in favor of keeping ATV's out of the area completely. ATV's have and are continuing to cause catastrophic destruction to ALL land in S.W. Maine. In doing so they've managed to close 95% of all privately owned land TO ALL USERS. Even though a new law went into effect last year, the destruction continues unabated. Please do not let this happen to any of our state lands.
- We would like to see a year-round BPL Officer stationed in the area to enforce all state regulations.

From: William Barker, Presque Isle (April 21, 2005)

- To be honest I'm not sure if it would be good or bad to allow the use of ATV's. One thing you need to look at is how ATV use is affecting other public lands where there is permitted use. Seboomook is fairly remote and it would be hard to regulate where ATV's are going, and there is no way to keep them off private lands surrounding the unit. Even if the Unit is removed from North Maine Woods (which I am 100% against) ATV's could still access the private roads adjacent to the unit.
- ATV use should be discussed with North Maine Woods to see what could be arranged. Suggested an approach where we allow ATV's to enter the Unit on designated trails, but not allow them to be brought onto the Unit in a vehicle over the roads. Then people could not haul an ATV through the Unit into surrounding NMW territory.

From: Ralph Cleale, Limington (April 29, 2005)

- The following comments are from me and my partners, land and campowners on Seboomook Lake and longstanding leaseholders since the mid-1940's. Our camp is almost entirely used for hunting and some fishing and snowsledding, and little canoeing.
- ATV's are a nuisance and they do damage. We oppose them. You can't control them as they are made to go around

obstacles.

- Snowmobiles do little if any harm. We support the continued use by snowmobiles.
- We encourage more areas to be accessible by snowmobile, including Spencer and Seboomook mountains.
- Traditional access for hunting is of utmost importance, except in areas of active harvesting.
- Preservation of deer wintering areas is crucial. Moose can survive in clearcuts, deer cannot.
- We want then Seboomook South Shore Road, the Dam Road, the Roll Dam Road, and others that now exist to be kept passable to pickups. We are not interested in having new roads, but we'd also like to see some of the woods roads left open, like the new road off 7-Mile Hill to the south side of Carry Brook and the Gulliver Brook Road to Seboomook Mountain and Third St. John Pond for hunting and fishing. It's too far to hike in or drag a deer out.
- We don't object to the South Shore Road being used as a snowsled trail so long as the (Seboomook) Campground is accessible from the dam side.
- I have never understood why horses are banned. I would like to be able to truck our ponies to camp so my wife and I could drive our carts there.
- The spring near the former Forest Service camp and the Seboomook Ledge camping spot by the dam is vital to us. It is the sole source of potable water since the spring at 7-Mile Hill's camping spot was allowed to deteriorate. I've used this water since 1945.
- We suggest that a way to portage around the ledges and the bridge on the North Branch be cleared. I am 70 this year and cannot climb the bank dragging a canoe even with help and it's not safe to run the canoe down the river at this spot even in good conditions.
- If harvesting will be going on we'd like to know when and where it will happen, perhaps by checking a map on a computer web site.

From: Jym St. Pierre, RESTORE (May 1, 2005)

I support

- Creating a category (in the Integrated Management Policy allocation system) for high value areas apart from ecological reserves.
- Constructing a hiking trail along the South and West Branches of the Penobscot.
- Developing trailhead parking for Big Spencer Mountain.
- Limiting the Big Spencer Mountain trail to pedestrian use.
- Keeping parking out of the St. John Ponds area.
- Preparing a brochure for the Seboomook Unit/Penobscot Corridor with information about rare plants.
- Designating separate winter areas for nonmotorized and motorized uses.
- Restricting ATV use.

From: Stanley Hallett, Windsor (May 2, 2005)

- I have been a lessee and now a landowner on Seboomook Lake for 38 years.
- Although I know that Seboomook campground is not part of the Seboomook Unit, some arrangement should be made for public use of the launch facilities that have existed there since Moosehead Lake was invented. It is the only launch site on Moosehead Lake on that side of the lake between Rockwood and Northeast Carry. After paying the gate fee at 20 mile and then to get charged a daily fee by Seboomook Campground is unacceptable. It has always been available to the public until 5 years ago. This has been brought by several people to the attention of the Department of Conservation, IF&W, and Wagner Forest Management. For some unknown reason no one wants to discuss the issue. It is a shame and something should be done for the public to have access to Moosehead Lake.
- The new minimum flows at Seboomook dam will be a disaster for landowners on Seboomook Lake. This will severely limit launching a boat on Seboomook Lake.
- Traditional existing North Wood uses should continue as is. No ATV's should ever be allowed. The so called loop trail around Moosehead lake goes within 300 yards of my camp and I can see them coming down my driveway if they are allowed. There is simply no way you can restrict them to a given trail. It would not happen. It would just be another problem for campowners with break-ins and vandalism.

Summary of Written Comments
from
Scoping Sessions Related to the North Maine Woods Gate and Fees

(August 31, 2004, October 12, 2004, December 6, 2004)

(Comments excerpted or summarized. Typographical, grammatical, or formatting comments have been corrected where possible.)

From: Gary and Joyce Day, Pittston Academy Grant (August 20, September 8, November 22, 2004)

- This is such a large area and could still be called one of the last frontiers; we would love to see it remain as much a wilderness as it is today. One way to help accomplish this is to maintain some form of a checkpoint system, and require a persons name, address, and license plate number to control vandalism.
- To maintain the many campsites and picnic areas that are available costs many dollars. Let the people who enjoy it pay for maintaining it.
- Please don't let this area go the way the Spring Lake-Dead River area did years ago. My parents used to go there but soon the rowdiness and lack of respect took over and that is why we are in this lovely region.
- NMW has plenty of experience maintaining campsites and overseeing the check gate system; let them continue. I'm sure they can maintain these services much more economically than the State. Please remember that there are still many of us who are very happy with the present operations.

From: Paul Fichtner, Penobscot Lake Lodge (September 17, 2004)

- As a landowner behind the gates, I am very interested in finding a suitable resolution to the NMW gate issue, which is a very hot item.

From: Shirley A. Raymond, Raymond's Store, North East Carry (Oct.15, 2004)

- Fees to access the woods to go camping or for people to access private property should be per vehicle, not per person.

From: Rick and Jeanine Sylvester, Seboomook Wilderness Campground and Store (Oct.12, 2004)

- If there are to be checkpoints at the entrances to the Seboomook Unit then the Department of Conservation should be the gatekeepers.
- There should be no fee for landowners, their guests, and customers visiting the businesses within the Seboomook Unit. The present system treats the businesses and small landowners within the Seboomook Unit unfairly.
- Fewer people are coming (to our business) each year because of NMW's high fees. Their response is to raise prices every year. This cannot be sustained.
- Not only are the fees unfair but the service at the gates is confused and inconsistent due to a high turnover of gate attendants. People are overcharged, and gate attendants give out wrong information about our business, such as saying we are closed when we are not.
- There are only two businesses within the Seboomook Unit, and we provide numerous services that are vital to the region. Most cell phones won't work in the region, so we installed special Yagi antennas for our cell phones that enable us to call 911 when there are emergencies. Seboomook and Pittston have both helped people needing emergency assistance in the past and will continue to do so. When people visiting or living in the region are in need of supplies or if their vehicles break down, they come to our businesses for help. We provide gas, propane, ice, food, lodging, groceries, some hardware, automotive, plumbing and electrical supplies, etc. Given the fact that our two businesses provide these needed services, it is crucial that the 20 mile gate and all the negativity it projects be removed.

From: Bruce Pratt, Eddington (October 12, 2004)

- Maine has a historical (social) contract with all of our citizens regarding access to state owned lands. Or those lands over which the state has been granted easements. What is the state doing charging a toll, actually a head

tax, for access to the West Branch Region? Why must I pay to get to my own property when passing over state lands?

- Fees have discouraged my brother and many like him from coming to Maine to visit us. Maine loses tourism dollars as a result. This is costing our state real revenue.

From: Bruce Marcoux (October 12, 2004)

- Each year I pay 7% tax of \$87.50 to the State of Maine for my rental site at Seboomook Campground. I feel this tax is more than enough for me and my family and guests to have to pay for the right to cross, hunt, fish or recreate on State owned land.
- Pay gates should have no place on land of participating tree growth landowners. I ask the Department of Conservation to be a leader in this access issue and help Maine people gain access they are already paying for.

From: Paul Johnson, (retired) IF&W Regional Fisheries Biologist, Greenville (Oct 13, 2004)

- I am an advocate for gates at the access points to the Seboomook Unit as a means to manage recreation. The cost issue can be worked out.

From: Sandra Neily, Greenville (Oct 12 and 19, 2004)

- NMW is a failing business by any business measure, despite their good intentions and hard work. It's losing money, suppressing demand (and therefore reducing its income stream), and cannot fulfill all the traditional and especially the newly developing functions needed for this region.
- Because it is suppressing demand (and fees are preventing access to public lands....and to public water and the public's wildlife) the current system does not serve Maine people well. People come and go without learning how to behave in the backcountry, fully appreciate private landowners' needs, resources, and contributions, and they certainly come and go ignorant of Maine's unique conservation lands and how they as users can support that process in the future.
- And there are further costs; the current gate and fee system is, at best, a public relations void (missed opportunities to "tell the story") and, at worst, a public relations disaster for land owners and now potentially, for the state. The quality of a visitor's experience will be as much determined by his or her reception and education as it will be by the actual experience itself. This entire function is missing from the current gate and access system.
- NMW is however, a wonderful model of a cooperative landowner process that has strong value. Its most successful functions are its value for collecting, organizing and educating new landowners as lands continue to change hands here and become even more fragmented (and I think we should support that process in every way that we can.) I am suggesting that this landowner model work in partnership with gateway communities that surround the entire NMW partnership territory. Enlarge the partnership.
- Gateway communities could provide the information and recreation management function (with the state) while at the same time being good locations for people to get fire permits, have boats checked for invasives, get licenses, get information on campsites, destinations, local recreation providers and businesses. For this to work it will need a professional recreation manager (s) who is in charge of hiring the staff for gateway welcome centers and gates, designing the training courses and on-site followups and supervision of welcome staffers, and working with towns on welcome center functions and information systems.
- We might be able to have a vastly simplified gate system, managed very cheaply.... and still have permits sold in the gateway communities. We could even come up with a Transpass kind of system that reduces the need to have multiple workers at remote gates. NMW could have fewer "minders" of the system and permit numbers could still be logged into a system so we know where folks are any given time.
- Users should pay by car and there needs to be a careful process to evaluate how access fees combine with camping fees to make some trips unaffordable for many people.

From: John Banks, Bangor (October 19, 2004)

- It is clear to me, especially after the meeting on Tues., that the concerns go beyond just the fees. Many are concerned about the hassle of the check-in and check-out process and the attitude of the gatekeepers. My experiences of passing through the gates many, many times are consistent with these concerns.

- As a seasonal resident of Seboomook Campground I would gladly pay \$50 or even \$100 a year to pass thru the gates in a manner that is as least disruptive as possible to my use and enjoyment of the region.
- A solution to the problem as it relates to Seboomook (and perhaps Pittston Farm) may be to have a sticker system which authorizes unencumbered passage thru the gates. Stickers, like the ones needed to go to the town dump, could be purchased by seasonal residents and other campowners in the region and displayed on one's vehicle, thereby saving a lot of hassle and lots of paperwork as well.

I would love to see the gates gone. I do not think they are necessary.

From: William Barker, Presque Isle (February 22, 2005)

- I've traveled that area since I was a teenager and I'm happy with the checkpoint where it is.
- I know the argument of the people who want free access is "my tax dollars are paying for this, and I shouldn't have to pay to use the land." My argument is "my tax dollars are paying for the land, and even more of my tax dollars are paying to allow free use of the land." I feel the tax burden in this state would be less if more fees were charged on the state owned lands.

From: Sherwin Start, Sanford (June 14, 2005)

- Although I in principle agree with them (NMW) in trying to control the number of people on their lands with gates and by using fees, this system isn't going to work for the general public's right of access to state lands, unless you classify these lands as State Parks.
- This is a problem that will have to either be worked out or call upon the State Legislature/Governor to resolve it. It looks to me that NMW and others have pretty much priced out the lower, middle and retired class of the population, and their lands are reserved for the very wealthiest of the population.

From: Rick Sylvester, Seboomook Wilderness Campground (May 10, 2006)

- I am very pleased with the Department's Vision statement and also the revised management recommendations for the Seboomook Unit. The only major problem left to deal with is access. I feel that the NMW is going to move their 20-mile checkpoint to a point north of the Canada Falls access road. If they choose to do this they must take into consideration two other access roads traditionally used by visitors to the Seboomook Unit. The Seboomook Dam road and Seboomook Road from the dam to the easterly border of the Seboomook Unit and on to Northeast Carry. These two roads must not be blocked off. If checkpoints must be installed on these two essential access points then so be it. Thousands of people access these roads each year. Businesses located at both ends in and out of the Unit depend on customers being able to get to them on these roads. Visitors to Roll Dam coming from the Millinocket, Baxter Park area would have to travel about 40 additional miles to get there. Visitors traveling out of the Unit to Lobster Lake area would have to travel an even greater distance. Blocking off these two access roads would make no sense and would be very detrimental to the overall accessibility and to the management of the Seboomook Unit. If access is to be managed on these two roads, then it is my feeling that it must be accomplished with manned checkpoints or at the very least some kind of solar powered entrance system that would let people in and out as long as they have the proper codes or passes.

Appendix D

Deed Restrictions and Agreements

Available on request; contact Kathy Eickenberg
at 207-287-2163

1. Deed restriction for Big Spencer Mountain Ecological Reserve
2. Deed restriction for all shorelines related to loon nest sites
3. Letter from The Nature Conservancy (12/11/2003) agreeing to provide funds for acquisition of the St. John Ponds parcel and Baker Lake parcel subject to management requirements.

Appendix E

Guiding Statutes

MRSA Title 12

§1846. Access to public reserved lands

1. Legislative policy. The Legislature declares that it is the policy of the State to keep the public reserved lands as a public trust and that full and free public access to the public reserved lands to the extent permitted by law, together with the right to reasonable use of those lands, is the privilege of every citizen of the State. The Legislature further declares that it recognizes that such free and reasonable public access may be restricted to ensure the optimum value of such lands as a public trust but that such restrictions, if and when imposed, must be in strict accordance with the requirements set out in this section. [1997, c. 678, §13 (new).]

2. Establishment of restrictions on public access. [2001, c. 604, §10 (rp).]

3. Unlawful entry onto public reserved lands. [2001, c. 604, §10 (rp).]

4. Development of public facilities. The bureau may construct and maintain overnight campsites and other camping and recreation facilities. [1997, c. 678, §13 (new).]

5. User fees. The bureau may charge reasonable fees to defray the cost of constructing and maintaining overnight campsites and other camping and recreation facilities. [1997, c. 678, §13 (new).]

§1847. Management of public reserved lands

1. Purpose. The Legislature declares that it is in the public interest and for the general benefit of the people of this State that title, possession and the responsibility for the management of the public reserved lands be vested and established in the bureau acting on behalf of the people of the State, that the public reserved lands be managed under the principles of multiple use to produce a sustained yield of products and services by the use of prudent business practices and the principles of sound planning and that the public reserved lands be managed to demonstrate exemplary land management practices, including silvicultural, wildlife and recreation management practices, as a demonstration of state policies governing management of forested and related types of lands. [1997, c. 678, §13 (new) .]

2. Management plans. The director shall prepare, revise from time to time and maintain a comprehensive management plan for the management of the public reserved lands in accordance with the guidelines in this subchapter. The plan must provide for a flexible and practical approach to the coordinated management of the public reserved lands. In preparing, revising and maintaining such a management plan the director, to the extent practicable, shall compile and maintain an adequate inventory of the public reserved lands, including not only the timber on those lands but also the other multiple use values for which the public reserved lands are managed. In addition, the director shall consider all criteria listed in section 1858 for the location of public reserved lands in developing the management plan. The director is entitled to the full cooperation of the Bureau of Geology and Natural Areas, the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, the Maine Land Use Regulation Commission and the State Planning Office in compiling and maintaining the inventory of the public reserved lands. The director shall consult with those agencies as well as other appropriate state agencies in the preparation and maintenance of the comprehensive management plan for the public reserved lands. The plan must provide for the demonstration of appropriate management practices that will enhance the timber, wildlife, recreation, economic and other values of the lands. All management of the public reserved lands, to the extent practicable, must be in accordance with this management plan when prepared.

Within the context of the comprehensive management plan, the commissioner, after adequate opportunity for public review and comment, shall adopt a specific action plan for each unit of the public reserved lands system. Each action plan must include consideration of the related systems of silviculture and regeneration of forest resources and must provide for outdoor recreation including remote, undeveloped areas, timber, watershed protection, wildlife and fish. The commissioner shall provide adequate opportunity for public review and comment on any substantial revision of an action plan. Management of the public reserved lands before the action plans are completed must be in accordance with all other provisions of this section. [1999, c. 556, §19 (amd) .]

Appendix F

Glossary

“Age Class”: the biological age of a stand of timber; in single-aged stands, age classes are generally separated by 10-year intervals.

“ATV Trails”: designated trails of varying length with a variety of trail surfaces and grades, designed primarily for the use of all-terrain vehicles.

“All-Terrain Vehicles”: motor driven, off-road recreational vehicles capable of cross-country travel on land, snow, ice, marsh, swampland, or other natural terrain. For the purposes of this document an all-terrain vehicle includes a multi-track, multi-wheel or low pressure tire vehicle; a motorcycle or related 2-wheel vehicle; and 3- or 4-wheel or belt-driven vehicles. It does not include an automobile or motor truck; a snowmobile; an airmobile; a construction or logging vehicle used in performance of its common functions; a farm vehicle used for farming purposes; or a vehicle used exclusively for emergency, military, law enforcement, or fire control purposes (Title 12, Chapter 715, Section 7851.2).

“Bicycling/ Recreation Biking Trails”: designated trails of short to moderate length located on hard-packed or paved trail surfaces with slight to moderate grades, designed primarily for the use of groups or individuals seeking a more leisurely experience.

“Boat Access - Improved”: vehicle-accessible hard-surfaced launch sites with gravel or hard-surface parking areas. May also contain one or more picnic tables, an outhouse, and floats or docks.

“Boat Access - Unimproved”: vehicle-accessible launch sites with dirt or gravel ramps to the water and parking areas, and where no other facilities are normally provided.

“Campgrounds”: areas designed for transient occupancy by camping in tents, camp trailers, travel trailers, motor homes, or similar facilities or vehicles designed for temporary shelter. Developed campgrounds usually provide toilet buildings, drinking water, picnic tables, and fireplaces, and may provide disposal areas for RVs, showers, boat access to water, walking trails, and swimming opportunities.

“Carry-In Boat Access”: dirt or gravel launch sites accessible by foot over a short to moderate length trail, that generally accommodates the use of only small watercraft. Includes a trailhead with parking and a designated trail to the access site.

“Clear-cut”: an single-age harvesting method in which all trees or all merchantable trees are removed from a site in a single operation.

“Commercial Forest Land”: the portion of the landbase that is both available and capable of producing at least 20 cubic feet of wood or fiber per acre per year.

“Commercial Harvest”: any harvest from which forest products are sold. By contrast, in a pre-commercial harvest, no products are sold, and it is designed principally to improve stand quality and conditions.

“Community”: an assemblage of interacting plants and animals and their common environment, recurring across the landscape, in which the effects of recent human intervention are minimal (“Natural Landscapes Of Maine: A Classification Of Ecosystems and Natural Communities” Maine Natural Heritage Program. April, 1991).

“Cross-Country Ski Trails”: designated winter-use trails primarily available for the activity of cross-country skiing. Trails may be short to long for day or overnight use.

“Ecosystem Type”: a group of communities and their environment, occurring together over a particular portion of the landscape, and held together by some common physical or biotic feature. (“Natural Landscapes Of Maine: A Classification Of Ecosystems and Natural Communities.” Maine Natural Heritage Program, April, 1991).

“Folist Site”: areas where thick mats of organic matter overlay bedrock, commonly found at high elevations.

“Forest Certification”: A process in which a third party “independent” entity audits the policies and practices of a forest management organization against a set of standards or principles related to sustainable management. It may be limited to either land/forest management or product chain-of-custody, or may include both.

“Forest Condition (or condition of the forest)”: the state of the forest, including the age, size, height, species, and spatial arrangement of plants, and the functioning as an ecosystem of the combined plant and animal life of the forest.

“Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Certification”: A third-party sustainable forestry certification program that was developed by the Forest Stewardship Council, an independent, non-profit, non-governmental organization founded in 1993. The FSC is comprised of representatives from environmental and conservation groups, the timber industry, the forestry profession, indigenous peoples’ organizations, community forestry groups, and forest product certification organizations from 25 countries. For information about FSC standards see http://www.fscus.org/standards_criteria/ and www.fsc.org.

“Forest Type”: a descriptive title for an area of forest growth based on similarities of species and size characteristics.

“Group Camping Areas”: vehicle or foot-accessible areas designated for overnight camping by large groups. These may include one or more outhouses, several fire rings or fire grills, a minimum of one water source, and several picnic tables.

“Horseback Ride/Pack Stock Trails”: generally moderate to long-distance trails designated for use by horses, other ride, or pack stock.

“Invasive Species”: generally nonnative species which invade native ecosystems and successfully compete with and displace native species due to the absence of natural controls. Examples are purple loosestrife and the zebra mussel.

“Late successional”: The condition in the natural progression of forest ecosystems where long-lived tree species dominate, large stems or trunks are common, and the rate of ecosystem change becomes much more gradual. Late successional forest are also mature forests that, because of their age and stand characteristics, harbor certain habitat not found elsewhere in the landscape.

“Log Landings”: areas, generally close to haul roads, where forest products may be hauled to and stored prior to being trucked to markets.

“Management Roads”: roads designed for timber management and/or administrative use that may be used by the public as long as they remain in service. Management roads may be closed in areas containing special resources, where there are issues of public safety or environmental protection.

“Mature Tree”: a tree which has reached the age at which its height growth has significantly slowed or ceased, though its diameter growth may still be substantial. When its annual growth no longer exceeds its internal decay and/or crown loss (net growth is negative), the tree is over-mature.

“Motorized”: a mode of travel across the landbase which utilizes internal combustion or electric powered conveyances; which in itself constitutes a recreational activity, or facilitates participation in a recreational activity. This includes or assumes the use of mechanized forms of travel, such as a bicycle, for the same purpose.

“Mountain Bike Trails”: designated trails generally located on rough trail surfaces with moderate to steep grades, designed primarily for the use of mountain bicycles with all-terrain tires by individuals seeking a challenging experience.

“Multi-aged Management”: management which is designed to retain two or more age classes and canopy layers at all times. Its harvest methods imitate natural disturbance regimes which cause partial stand replacement (shelterwood with reserves) or small gap disturbances (selection).

“Natural Resource Values”: described in Maine’s Natural Resource Protection Act to include coastal sand dunes, coastal wetlands, significant wildlife habitat, fragile mountain areas, freshwater wetlands, great ponds and rivers, streams, and brooks. For the purposes of this plan they also include unique or unusual plant communities.

“Non-mechanized”: a mode of travel across the landbase which does not utilize internal combustion, electric, or mechanically powered conveyances; which in itself constitutes a recreational activity, or facilitates participation in a recreational activity.

“Non-native (Exotic)”: a species that enters or is deliberately introduced into an ecosystem beyond its historic range, except through natural expansion, including organisms transferred from other countries into the state, unnaturally occurring hybrids, cultivars, genetically altered or engineered species or strains, or species or subspecies with nonnative genetic lineage.

“Old Growth Stand”: a stand in which the majority of the main crown canopy consists of long-lived or late successional species usually 150 to 200 years old or older, often with characteristics such as large snags, large downed woody material, and multiple age classes, and in which evidence of human-caused disturbance is absent or old and faint.

“Old Growth Tree”: for the purposes of this document, a tree which is in the latter stages of maturity or is over-mature.

“Pesticide”: a chemical agent or substance employed to kill or suppress pests (such as insects, weeds, fungi, rodents, nematodes, or other organism) or intended for use as a plant regulator, defoliant, or desiccant. (from LURC Regulations, Ch. 10)

“Primitive Campsites”: campsites that are rustic in nature, have one outhouse, and may include tent pads, Adirondack-type shelters, and rustic picnic tables. Campsites may be accessed by vehicle, foot, or water.

“Public Road or Roadway”: any roadway which is owned, leased, or otherwise operated by a government body or public entity. (from LURC Regulations, Ch. 10)

“Public Use Roads”: all-weather gravel or paved roads designed for two-way travel to facilitate both public and administrative access to recreation facilities. Includes parking facilities provided for the public. Management will include roadside aesthetic values normally associated with travel influenced zones.

“Recreation Values”: the values associated with participation in outdoor recreation activities.

“Regeneration”: both the process of establishing new growth and the new growth itself, occurring naturally through seeding or sprouting, and artificially by planting seeds or seedlings.

“Remote Ponds”: As defined by the Maine Land Use Regulation Commission: ponds having no existing road access by two-wheel drive motor vehicles during summer months within ½ mile of the normal high water mark of the body of water with no more than one noncommercial remote camp and its accessory structures within ½ mile of the normal high water mark of the body of water, that support cold water game fisheries.

“Riparian”: an area of land or water that includes stream channels, lakes, floodplains and wetlands, and their adjacent upland ecosystems.

“Salvage”: a harvest operation designed to remove dead and dying timber in order to remove whatever value the stand may have before it becomes unmerchantable.

“Selection”: related to multi-aged management, the cutting of individual or small groups of trees; generally limited in area to patches of one acre or less.

“Service Roads”: summer or winter roads located to provide access to Bureau-owned lodging, maintenance structures, and utilities. Some service roads will be gated or plugged to prevent public access for safety, security, and other management objectives.

“Silviculture”: the branch of forestry which deals with the application of forest management principles to achieve specific objectives with respect to the production of forest products and services.

“Single-aged Management”: management which is designed to manage single age, single canopy layer stands. Its harvest methods imitate natural disturbance regimes which result in full stand replacement. A simple two-step (seed cut/removal cut) shelterwood is an example of a single-aged system.

“Snowmobile Trails”: designated winter-use trails of varying length located on a groomed trail surfaces with flat to moderate grades, designed primarily for the use of snowmobiles.

“Stand”: a group of trees, the characteristics of which are sufficiently alike to allow uniform classification.

“Succession/ successional”: progressive changes in species composition and forest community structure caused by natural processes over time.

“Sustainable Forestry/ Harvest”: that level of timber harvesting, expressed as treated acres and/or volume removals, which can be conducted on a perpetual basis while providing for non-forest values. Ideally this harvest level would be “even-flow,” that is, the same quantity each year. In practice, the current condition of the different properties under Bureau timber management, and the ever-changing situation in markets, will dictate a somewhat cyclical harvest which will approach even-flow only over time periods of a decade or more.

“Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI)”: A third party sustainable forestry certification program that was developed in 1994 by the American Forest and Paper Association, which defines its program as “a comprehensive system of principles, objectives and performance measures that integrates the perpetual growing and harvesting of trees with the protection of wildlife, plants, soil and water quality.” To review SFI standards see http://www.afandpa.org/Content/NavigationMenu/Environment_and_Recycling/SFI/The_SFI_Standard/The_SFI_Standard.htm.

Appendix G

References

- Clark, James, Edward Moore, and Richard Will. 1998. Results of Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Storage Project (FERC No. 2634). For Great Northern Paper, Company. On file at the Maine Historic Preservation Commission, Augusta, ME.
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. December 22, 2004. Order on Offer of Settlement and Issuing New License, Great Lakes Hydro America, LLC, Project No. 2634. 109 FERC ¶ 62,230 (2004).
- Fermata, Inc. 2005. Executive Summary, Strategic Plan for Implementing the Maine Nature Tourism Initiative. For the Maine Department of Community and Economic Development, Augusta, ME. At <http://www.fermatainc.com/maine/>
- Forest Fire Lookout Association (FFLA) Maine Chapter. 2006. Maine Fire Tower Trivia.
- Forest Society of Maine. 2002. Big Spencer Mountain Conservation Easement Baseline Documentation Report. For, Maine Department of Conservation, Augusta, Maine.
- Framatome ANP DE&S, Inc. 2002. Great Lakes Hydro America Storage Project FERC No. 2634, Settlement Conference Whitewater Boating Study for Downstream Reaches of Canada Falls & Seboomook Impoundments. For Great Lakes Hydro America, Millinocket, Maine.
- Great Northern Paper, Inc. 1998. Final License Application. Storage Project FERC No. 2634. Three volumes. Great Northern Paper Company, Millinocket, ME.
- Hanlon, Greg and Sue Hanlon. 1999. Steep Creeks of New England, a Paddler's Guide. 29 Class V Runs for the Experienced Whitewater Enthusiast. New England Cartographics, Amherst, MA.
- Maine Department of Conservation, Bureau of Parks and Lands. 2000. Integrated Resource Policy for Public Reserved and Nonreserved Lands, State Parks, and State Historic Sites. MDOC, Augusta, ME.
- Maine Department of Conservation, Bureau of Parks and Lands. 2003. Maine State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, 2003-2008. MDOC, Augusta, ME.
- Maine Department of Conservation and U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service. 1982. Maine Rivers Study. MDOC, Augusta, ME.
- Maine Department of Conservation, Land Use Regulation Commission. 1999. Land Use Guidance Maps - Seboomook Township, Plymouth Township, Pittson Academy Grant, Soldiertown Township, West Middlesex Canal Grant, Big W Township, Little W Township, Comstock Township (the Seboomook and Canada Falls Parcels), T7R17

WELS (Baker Lake Parcel); T4R17 WELS (St. John Ponds Parcel); and TXR14 WELS and T2R13 WELS (Big Spencer Mountain).

Maine Department of Conservation, Land Use Regulation Commission. 2005. Chapter 10, Land Use Districts and Standards for areas within the Jurisdiction of the Maine Land Use Regulation Commission. MDOC, Augusta, ME.

Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife. On-line description of Wildlife Management Districts at <http://www.maine.gov/ifw/wmd/wmd4.htm> and <http://www.maine.gov/ifw/wmd/wmd9.htm>.

North Maine Woods. 2005. North Maine Woods Annual Report for the Fiscal Year 2004-2005 and Update on Operations for 2005-2006. North Maine Woods, Ashland, ME.

Plum Creek. 2006. Concept Plan for Plum Creek's Lands in the Moosehead Lake Region. Submitted to the Land Use Regulation Commission. At <http://www.maine.gov/doc/lurc/reference/resourceplans/moosehead.html>.

Reilly, Catherine J, and Charles Morris. 2004. Nature-Based and Cultural-Heritage Tourism in Piscataquis County, Survey Analysis. Margaret Chase Smith Center for Public Policy, University of Maine, Orono. At www.umaine.edu/mcsc/Research/EcoDev_menu.htm

Spiess, Arthur. 2004. West Branch Project: Review of Archaeological Sites. Maine Historic Preservation Commission, Augusta, ME.

Wilkerson, Brooke. 2005. Natural Resource Inventory of the Bureau of Parks and Lands Seboomook Unit. Maine Natural Areas Program, Department of Conservation, Augusta, ME.

Will, Richard T. 2005. Phase I Archaeological Survey of the South Branch of the Penobscot River between Canada Falls Lake and Seboomook Lake, Somerset County, Maine. For the Maine Historic Preservation Commission, Augusta, ME.

Yates, D., D.C. Evers, W. Goodale, and W. MacCabe. 2005. Monitoring of breeding Common Loons: West Branch of the Penobscot River area – 2004. Report BRI 2005-10. BioDiversity Research Institute, Gorham, ME.